REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application after this Amendment. Claims 1, 12, 18, 22, and 25 are independent. New claims 21-25 are submitted for consideration by the Examiner. In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to conform to U.S. patent practice. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of any rejections asserted against the claims.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to the title. The Examiner further rejected claims 1-11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sklarew* (USP 4,972,496); rejected claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sklarew* in view of *Borgstrom et al.* (USP 6,738,053); and rejected the remainder of the dependent claims using a variety of combinations of references. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Specification

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended the Abstract to remove any legal phraseology. Applicants have further amended the title of the invention. Based upon these amendments, it is

respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, by this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 14 to remove any indefinite terminology. Based upon these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Sklarew* teaches a filing appliance comprising means for holding a plurality of sheets including at least one input field which is provided with a position-coding pattern and is adapted to be filled in by means of a drawing device which records, using the position-coding pattern, positions in the input field in order to digitally record information entered in the input field, citing to col. 5, lines 57-67 and col. 7, line 38. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

The disclosure of *Sklarew* is directed to a handwritten keyboardless entry computer system. The system includes a transparent input screen that generates positional information when contacted by a stylus. The system includes a computer that has been programmed to compile the positional information into strokes, to

calculate stroke characteristics, and then compare the stroke characteristics with those stored in a database in order to recognize the symbol drawn by the stylus. (Abstract). *Sklarew* teaches at col. 5, lines 59-64 as follows:

> Stylus 16 (FIG. 2) is connected to the computer of system 10 with wire 17 (FIG. 2). As stylus 16 "writes" on input screen 18, a plurality of locating signals representative of a plurality of corresponding positional coordinates are transmitted to microcomputer 14.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a filing apparatus comprising means for holding a plurality of sheets, wherein at least one input field is provided with a position-coding pattern and is adapted to be filled in by a drawing device which records, using the position-coding pattern, positions in the input field in order to digitally record information entered in the input field. As indicated above, the stylus disclosed in *Sklarew* merely facilitates transmission of a plurality of locating signals to microcomputer 14. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Sklarew* that is directed to a drawing device which records positions in the input field using the position-coding pattern. As *Sklarew* fails to teach or suggest all of the elements as set forth in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that *Sklarew* fails to anticipate the present invention. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-11 and 21 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 12 and 22 contain elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, and thus claims 12 and 22, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable over *Sklarew* for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 -
Sklarew/Borgstrom et al.

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 18, the Examiner admits that *Sklarew* fails to teach or suggest a second information object to be related to a second filing appliance. The Examiner relies on the teachings of *Borgstrom et al.* to cure the deficiencies of *Sklarew*, asserting *Borgstrom et al.* teaches having multiple users using different appliances for an application, citing to col. 12, lines 61-67. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of *Borgstrom et al.* is directed to predefined electronic pen applications and specially formatted paper. At col. 12, lines 61-67, *Borgstrom et al.* teaches that the electronic pen ID allows an application to identify a particular user that is using the application and to distinguish between multiple concurrent users of the same

application, such as when different electronic pens are being used in connection with separate sheets of paper that each contain the same portion of the address pattern.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, a method for processing information comprising receiving buffered position information from a drawing device, the position information being generated when the drawing device is moved over a position-coding pattern, the position information including information that is generated before and after time point t_{act}. There is no disclosure in either *Sklarew* or *Borgstrom et al.*, either alone or in combination, assuming these references are combinable, which Applicants do not admit, that teaches or suggests receiving buffered position information from a drawing device. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the teachings of *Borgstrom et al.* to modify the teachings of *Sklarew*. *Sklarew* notes in the background portion of the specification in col. 1, lines 54-64 as follows:

> The desire in this system is to have its use as similar as possible to writing with pen or pencil on paper. One problem is proximity--a pen on paper only leaves a trail when actually in contact. Many of these technologies require an additional "pen down" sensor which is awkward to use in many commercial pens. Another problem is writing angle--

> a pen leaves the same trail independent of writing angle. Many of these technologies have the position detector displaced from the pen tip, so pen angle causes erroneous displacements.

As such, *Sklarew* appears to teach away from utilizing technology associated with "pen down" sensors, which is the sensor that is utilized in the disclosure of *Borgstrom et al.* As such, Applicant respectfully submits that, as the disclosure of *Sklarew* teaches away from the purported combination of references as asserted by the Examiner, these references are not combinable. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 19-20 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 18 at least based upon their dependency on claim 18.

By this amendment, Applicants have added new claim 25 for consideration by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the memory as recited in claim 25, and, as such, claim 25 is allowable over the art as cited.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview

in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MKM/CMV/jdm
3782-0193P

Attachment: New Abstract of the Disclosure